

REMARKS

In this response applicant requests reconsideration of the final Office Action of January 12, 2006 in which claims 1-5 and 7-12 were rejected. Independent claims 1, 7, 8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the “admitted prior art” on page 2, lines 13-22 of the description, the indicated passage relating to 3GPP TS 24.008 V 6.1.0. Dependent claims 4 and 9 are rejected for the same reasons. Dependent claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the “admitted prior art” referring to 3GPP TS 24.008 V 6.1.0 in view of Honda et al. (U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2004/0072580). Dependent claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the “admitted prior art” referring to 3GPP TS 24.008 V 6.1.0 in view of Timm et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,061). Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but is considered allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. With this response claims 1, 7, 8, 11 and 12 are amended and new claim 13 is added. For the reasons discussed below these amendments and the additional claim are proper and should be entered.

Applicant acknowledges the final rejection of independent claims 1, 7, 8, 11 and 12 and requests reconsideration of the claims, as amended. Independent claims 1, 7, 8, 11 and 12 have been amended to explicitly state that a mobile terminal and a terminal equipment are two separate entities. These changes are necessary because of the continued overly broad interpretation given to the claim language, and *could not have been made earlier* because applicant could not have anticipated that such interpretation would be continued in light of applicant’s previous response.


**Therefore, no further search or substantial consideration is necessary.**

In addition, new claim 13 is original claim 6 rewritten in independent form and incorporating all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and is allowable.

Independent Claim 1 is not Anticipated by the “Admitted Prior Art”


Claim 1 is amended to state explicitly that the mobile terminal and terminal equipment are two separate entities. (See e.g. Figure 1 where the mobile terminal and

terminal equipment are exemplified by a mobile phone and a laptop). The specification of the current application states that it was known from 3GPP TS 24.008 that a mobile terminal may be informed by a mobile communication network about a failure cause when a request for an establishment of a connection is rejected. The disclosed situation is thus as follows:



Concerning 3GPP TS 24.008, it is explicitly indicated in the description of the application (page 2, lines 26-32) that there is **no mechanism** to inform as well terminal equipment trying to access a mobile communication network via a mobile terminal. The “admitted prior art” 3GPP TS 24.008 only discloses exchange of messages between a mobile terminal and a network to indicate a cause of failure, and not between terminal equipment and a network via a mobile terminal. This is a disadvantage, since users using their terminal equipment (e.g. a laptop) to access a network via their mobile terminal (e.g. a mobile phone) look usually only at their terminal equipment and not in parallel at their mobile terminal.

In contrast, the method of claim 1 provides specifically for the case that a data exchange between terminal equipment and a mobile communication network is supported via a mobile terminal. The mobile terminal forwards a request from the terminal equipment to establish a connection to the mobile communication network. In case of a failure, an indication of a cause of the failure may be received by the mobile terminal from the network, as known from 3GPP TS 24.008. In addition, however, the mobile terminal forwards the indication to the terminal equipment. The situation according to claim 1 is thus as follows:



It is thus an advantage that information on the cause of a failure is available as well at the terminal equipment.

Therefore, the solution of providing that a mobile terminal forwards a received failure cause concerning a requested connection to terminal equipment requesting the connection is neither disclosed nor suggested in 3GPP TS 24.008.

Independent claims 7, 8, 11 and 12 relate equally to the aspect that a terminal receives a failure cause from a network via a mobile terminal, and similar amendments were made to these claims as claim 1 to show explicitly that the mobile terminal and terminal equipment are two separate entities. Thus, the same comments apply as for claim 1. In addition, dependent claims 4 and 9 are neither taught nor suggested by the “admitted prior art” at least in view of their dependencies.

For all of the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11-12 is requested.

Dependent Claims 2-3, 5 and 10 are Patentable


Dependent claims 2-3 depend directly from claim 1 and contain all the limitations recited therein, therefore dependent claims 2-3 are patentable at least in view of their dependencies. The obviousness rejections of claims 2-3 is also inapplicable and withdrawal thereof is requested.

Likewise, dependent claims 5 and 10 depend directly from independent claims 1 and 8, which have been shown to be patentable, and therefore dependent claims 5 and 10 are patentable at least in view of their dependencies. The obviousness rejection of claims 5 and 10 is also inapplicable and withdrawal thereof is requested.

Conclusion

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of January 12, 2006, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-13 to issue is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Francis J. Maguire".

Francis J. Maguire

Attorney for the Applicant

Registration No. 31,391

FJM/djc  
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234